

## REMARKS

Claims 1-19 and 34-46 are pending in the application. Claims 1-19 and 34-46 are rejected. Claim 17 is amended to correct a typographical error.

As discussed below, all of the claims are in condition for allowance. **But if after considering this response, the Examiner does not allow all of the claims, then the Applicant's agent formally requests that the Examiner contact him to schedule and conduct a telephone interview before issuing a subsequent office action.**

**Rejection of Claims 1-13, 15-18, 34-42, 44-46 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Cannon (U.S. Pat. No. 6,842,447) in view of Oran (US Pat. No. 6,275,574) and Hyams et al. (U.S. Pat No. 7,415,029)**

### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites, in part, "...the gateway is further configured to automatically determine the operating characteristics of handsets coupled to each handset port..."

For example, at page 9, lines 15 – 19: "First [the gateway] sends a set of signals to each handset port that is designed to produce a different response from each different proprietary handset that the gateway is intended to work with. Then the signal that is received in response is processed and compared to data stored in the ROM to identify the type of handset on that port..." Thus, "automatic" determination of the operating characteristics of handsets uses the conventional meaning of the word automatic, "having the capability of operating independently."

The Examiner agrees that neither Cannon nor Oran provide relevant disclosure.

Hyams apparently does not disclose automatically determining the operating characteristics of handsets coupled to each handset port.

Per Hyams, FIG. 4, a user defines a state, an event, or an action of a telephony protocol (410) [emphasis added]. The user-defined states, event, or action is then downloaded to a CAS engine (420). The telephony protocol of the CAS engine corresponding to idle telephone lines associated with the CAS engine are then changed based on the user defined state, event, or action (430). At column 3, lines 6 – 10,

Hyams states, "...various tables may be loaded into the CAS module by the management subsystem

Hyams apparently does not disclose that loading tables into the CAS module may be performed automatically. Hyams does disclose, "other methods of downloading the application to the CAS engine may be used. This may be obtained by command line interpretation, SNMP or other protocols from remote sources such as the call agent." However, Hyams does not disclose or reasonably suggest that the CAS module or the management subsystem may operate by "automatically determine the operating characteristics of handsets coupled to each handset port."

Therefore the combination of Cannon, Oran, and Hyams fails to disclose or reasonably suggest all the limitations of claim 1, and claim 1 is allowable over Cannon, Oran, and Hyams.

#### **Claims 2 - 13**

Claims 2-13 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

#### **Claim 15**

Claim 15 recites, in part, "a gateway ... configured to send a set of signals to each non-IP digital PBX telephone handset designed to produce a different response from each of a plurality of different proprietary handsets and process the response or responses that are received to identify the type of each non-IP digital PBX telephone handset."

For example, FIG 1A shows a gateway 11 coupled to a remote IP call controller 12. Page 9, lines 15 – 19 describes how signals are sent to each handset and the responses processed.

The Examiner admits that Cannon and Oran fail to disclose or reasonably suggest sending "a set of signals to each non-IP digital PBX telephone handset designed to produce a different response from each of a plurality of different proprietary handsets and process[ing] the response or responses that are received to identify the type of each non-IP digital PBX telephone handset."

Contrary to the Examiner's contention, Hyams does not disclose or reasonably suggest the recited language.

In particular, Hyams does not disclose that the Tx LSD FSM sends a set of signals designed to produce a different response from each of a plurality of different

proprietary handsets. Hyams simply indicates that “for tones or dial pulses there may be parameters found in a table.” Hyams makes no indication that the parameters are in any way selected to elicit different responses from different types of handsets.

Moreover, Hyams indicates that the Tx LSD FSM sends a signal out to the PBX, not the individual telephone handsets. Since a PBX translates call control signals, there is no apparent way for signals from Hyams’ transmitter to reach the handsets, and there is no apparent way for signals from the handsets to reach Hyams’ Rx LSD FSM. Thus, even if Hyams did disclose that the parameters in the tables are selected to elicit different responses from different types of handsets, the signals generated therefrom would be lost in translation through the PBX.

Accordingly, Cannon, Oran, and Hyams, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or reasonably suggest all the limitations of claim 15, and claim 15 is allowable over Cannon, Oran, and Hyams.

**Claim 16**

Claim 16 is allowable by virtue of its dependence from claim 15.

**Claim 17**

Claim 17 is allowable for reasons similar to those given for claim 15.

**Claim 18**

Claim 18 is allowable by virtue of its dependence from claim 17.

**Claim 34**

Claim 34 is amended. Claim 34 is allowable for reasons similar to those given for claims 1 and 15.

Specifically, Cannon, Oran, and Hyams, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or reasonably suggest a gateway that “send[s] a set of signals ... to each telephone handset designed to produce a different response from each of a plurality of different proprietary handsets.” Cannon, Oran, and Hyams, alone and in combination, also fail to disclose or reasonably suggest a gateway that “process[es] the response or responses that are received to identify the type of each non-IP digital PBX telephone handset.”

Therefore, Cannon, Oran, and Hyams, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or reasonably suggest all the limitations of claim 34, and claim 34 is allowable over Cannon, Oran, and Hyams.

**Claims 35 - 42**

Claims 35-42 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from claim 34.

**Claims 44-45**

Claims 44-45 are allowable by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

**Rejection of Claims 14, 19, and 43 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Over Cannon and Oran and Hyams And Further In View of Bailis (WO 00/11818)**

**Claims 14 and 43**

Claims 14 and 43 are allowable by virtue of their respective dependence from claims 1 and 34 and for at least the reasons given for claims 1 and 34.

**Claim 19**

Claim 19 is allowable for reasons similar to those given for claims 1 and 15.

Specifically, Claim 19 recites a gateway card having one or more protocol translating circuits that send a set of signals to each non-IP digital PBX telephone handset designed to produce a different response from each of a plurality of different proprietary handsets and process the response or responses that are received to identify the type of each non-IP digital PBX telephone handset.

Cannon, Oran, Hyams, and Bailis, alone and in combination, fail to disclose a gateway card having one or more protocol translating circuits that send a set of signals to each non-IP digital PBX telephone handset designed to produce a different response from each of a plurality of different proprietary handsets and process the response or responses that are received to identify the type of each non-IP digital PBX telephone handset.

Accordingly, Cannon, Oran, Hyams, and Bailis, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or reasonably suggest all the limitations of claim 19, and claim 19 is allowable over Cannon, Oran, Hyams, and Bailis.

In the event additional fees are due as a result of this amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency of fees submitted herewith, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-1897.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be helpful, he is respectfully requested to contact the Applicants' agent at (425) 455-5575.

Dated this 1<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/CAWiklof/

Christopher A. Wiklof  
Registration No. 43,990

Customer No. 000996

Graybeal Jackson LLP  
155 - 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Suite 350  
Bellevue, Washington 98004-5973  
Telephone: 425.455.5575  
Facsimile: 425.455.1046